

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 1, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

I. Summary of Final Office Action

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,292; hereafter “Shen”) and in view of Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,032,236; hereafter “Ozkan”).

II. Summary of Amendment

In this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 7 and 10, and cancels claims 3, 9 and 13-16. As the amendments are only based on the existing claims as discussed below, they do not raise new issues requiring further consideration and search by the Examiner, and thus, entrance of the amendments is respectfully requested.

III. Analysis of Prior Art Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 is amended by basically incorporating some features recited in claim 4 and entire subject matter of claim 3. The “program information” is now defined as comprising Program and System Information Protocol (PSIP) information in an Advanced Television Systems Committee (ATSC) standard format, and the “converted program information” is now defined comprising Program Specific Information (PSI) in an IEEE 1394 standard format. As well known in the art, the Selection Information Table (SIT) and Discontinuity Information Table (DIT) are exemplary tables of the PSI, claim 1 as amended does not raise new issues requiring further consideration and search by the Examiner.

Turning to the Examiner’s rejection of claim 4 which subject matter is now covered by claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Shen and Ozkan, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the aspects of the claimed video receiver.

To begin with, Shen does not teach or suggest any processing of PSIP information in an ATSC standard format as the Examiner admits in the office action (page 4, lines 14) that Shen

fails to disclose the program information. This deficiency of Shen is much clearer as the program information is defined as comprising PSIP information in an ATSC standard format and the converted program information is defined as comprising PSI in an IEEE 1394 standard format. Thus, the claimed conversion of PSIP information into PSI does no more read on a mere A/D conversion disclosed in Shen even by a very broad interpretation. In this respect, it is notable that the set top box 306 (Fig. 3 of Shen) does not perform any conversion on the program information.

Turning to Ozkan, the Examiner refers to the flowchart of Fig. 12 directed to forming PSI and the video receiver system of Fig. 13 to allege that Ozkan discloses (i) converting PSIP information into PSI; and (ii) generating a data stream comprising PSI and decoded program data.

However, the flowchart and related descriptions (col. 9, line 55 to col. 10, line 55) of Ozkan only disclose *forming* PSI as titled therein, but does not teach or suggest decoding and subsequent processing of PSIP information in an ATSC standard format. Stated in detail, the flowchart only discloses *generating* PSI according to data structuring criteria (step 253), but does not teach or suggest decoding a broadcasting program, (parsing program data and program information therefrom), decoding the PSIP information, and converting the decoded PSIP information into PSI having a different format suitable for a connected apparatus. The flowchart fails to teach, *inter alia*, a decoding operation before converting the PSIP information into PSI, because the steps therein are directed to initial formation or generation of PSI. This formation or generation is not an operation performed on PSIP information received as a part of a broadcasting program signal, and subsequently decoded for a following conversion.

The video receiver system of Ozkan (Fig. 13) also fails to teach or suggest the foregoing elements (i) and (ii) of the claimed apparatus. Not any component of the decoder 100 or decoder 17 teaches or suggests converting PSIP information into PSI based on the IEEE 1394. In addition, Ozkan does not teach or suggest generating a data stream comprising the PSI based on based on the IEEE 1394 and decoded program data. Specifically, not any format change or encoding, if any, within the decoder 100 (Fig. 13 of Ozkan) corresponds to the claimed conversion or generation of a data stream.

In addition, Ozkan does not teach or suggest creating at least one new table in the suitable format for recording by using at least of plural tables associated with the program information. While Shen does not teach or suggest any processing of PSIP information in an ATSC standard format, there could not have been any suggestion and motivation to incorporate into Shen the teachings of table generation in Ozkan.

At least under the above analysis, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 should not be rendered obvious over the references. Corresponding method claim 7 is amended in a similar manner for claim 1 amendment, and thus, should be allowable at least for similar reasons.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 should be allowable due to their dependencies and additionally recited elements.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Scuncheon Park
Registration No. 60,719

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 1, 2008